

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 13 and 15-20 are amended by the present amendment.

Claim amendments find support in the specification as originally filed, at least at page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 26, and page 15, lines 7-15. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,121,981 to Trower, II et al. (herein “Trower”); and Claims 2, 7, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trower in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,303 to Foreman et al. (herein “Foreman”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Trower.

Claim 1 is directed to a moving picture playback method of playing back a moving picture, that includes, in part, a first window formed on a display screen based on a predetermined software, and a second window formed within a range of a display region of the first window. The second window includes a moving picture display region which displays a moving picture and moves in association with movement of the first window with a relative position with respect to the first window. Independent Claims 5, 13 and 16 include similar features.

In other words, in an embodiment according to the claimed invention, a second window including an animated character region (e.g., the moving picture display region) moves in association with movement of a first window. That is, the motion of the second window is dependent on the movement of the first window.

Applicants respectfully submit that Trower does not teach or suggest each feature of the independent claims. For example, Trower fails to teach or suggest a second window that includes a moving picture display region which displays a moving picture and which moves in association with movement of the first window.

Trower describes a user interface, referred to as the "desktop," including a shell 62 of the operating system as well as a couple of windows 64, 66 associated with currently running application programs.¹ The animated character, described by Trower, moves in the foreground of the desktop, and is independent from the user interface and each of the other windows.² In other words, the animated character region is independent from the other windows. Thus, the animated character region of Trower does not move in association with or dependent upon a movement of a first window. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Trower fails to teach or suggest a moving picture playback method that includes "forming on the first window a second window including a moving picture display region which displays the moving picture . . . and moving in association with movement of the first window with a relative position with respect to the first window," as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent Claims 5, 13 and 16.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 5, 13 and 16, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Trower.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 2, 7, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Trower in view of Foreman.

Claims 2, 7, 14 and 18 depend from independent Claims 1, 5, 13 and 16, respectively, which as discussed above are believed to patentably define over Trower. Foreman describes a graphical user interface for editing a computer motion video having a single window interface with a plurality of alternatively selectable interfaces each having a video region for

¹ Trower at column 5, lines 1-3.

² Trower at column 5, lines 13-19.

previewing a motion video to be edited.³ Further, Forman indicates that a video program can be played back at a full rate, paused to show a still frame.⁴ However, Foreman fails to supply the claimed features lacking in the disclosure of Trower, as discussed above.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Trower and Foreman, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest forming a third window within a range of a display region of the second window and moving in association with movement of the second window, and setting the moving picture display region to a shape according to a shape change of the moving picture and moving in association with movement of the second window.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 5, 13 and 16, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719

EHK:ZSS:dnf
I:\ATTY\ZS\21's\218\218436US\218436 AMENDMENT 040506.DOC

³ Forman at column 2, lines 35-41.

⁴ Forman at column 11, 44-46.